

Dkt. No.: OP-093000122

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 18 are pending in this application. The Examiner has objected claims 1, 6 and 7 for various informalities and rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai et al. (US 6057636).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 10 and added claim 18. No new matter has been introduced. Moreover, claim 6 has been cancelled. It is believed that the objections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Sakai do not disclose Applicant's amended claim 1, as refer to Figure 4 or 6, that the second conductive layer 64 or 64' of the mesh structure 6 disposed between a plurality of anode units and cathode units of a tetraode field emission display includes a plurality of isolation slits 642 formed at two elongate sides of each third aperture 641 or 641' as the conductive strips. Each pair of the conductive strips constructs an independent conductive path to be biased with a potential and a gate operative to drain electron from the cathode unit between the pair of conductive strips is formed, see Applicants' spec. page 6, line 17 to page 7, line 1.

Furthermore, Sakai also do not disclose Applicants' amended claim 7, as in Spec. page 7, lines 15-23, that the gate layer 64" of the mesh structure 6 of a tetra-polar field-emission display includes a plurality of "threadlike" conductive lines 645 located adjacent to the insulation layer 63, referring to Applicants' Figure 7. A pair of conductive lines 645 sandwiches a row of the first apertures 621, referring to Applicants' Figure 8.

As to the amended claims 3, 5 and 10, Sakai's disclosure does not show each aperture of the insulating spacer 15 or the control electrode 14 covering or aligned with a row or a column of the apertures of the inducing electrode 40 as same as in Applicants' Figures 3 and

AMENDMENT

10/823,759

- 6 -

Dkt. No.: OP-093000122

6. Moreover, Sakai 's disclosed inducing electrode 40 does not include the aperture aligned with a corresponding anode unit with a phospher layer and cathode unit with an emission layer as of newly added claim 18.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. As stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(Emphases added).

Accordingly, the pending claims 1-10 and 18 are not anticipated by Sakai and should be patentable. Therefore, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and such a Notice is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kuo-Rong Chen
Kuo-Rong Chen

Te-Fong Chan
Te-Fong Chan

Kuei-Wen Cheng
Kuei-Wen Cheng

AMENDMENT

10/823,759

- 7 -